

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,349	ASIUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul B. Prebilic	3774	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul B. Prebilic. (3)_____.

(2) Burton Amernick. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 27 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claims generally.


Identification of prior art discussed: Sander and Ron, patents of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


Paul B. Prebilic
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Amernick stressed that Sander discloses putties in his examples and he asserted that the material of Sander is not reconstitutable to form a hydrogel. He also argued that the reasons for allowance in the parent application stressed that Ron disclosed a putty and not a gel. The reexamination on the parent application also stressed this difference, and he pointed out that the examples of Sanders failed to mention particle size. Mr Amernick said that he was going to file arguments to that effect. The Examiner stated that he would have to consider these arguments in detail once the response is filed.